

Appl. No. 09/643,755  
Amdt. Dated  
Reply to Office action of December 16, 2003

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

By the present amendment, claims 1, 17, 21 and 22 have been amended, claims 18-20 have been deleted and a new claim 21 has been added. The amendments to the claims have been made without prejudice and without acquiescing to any of the Examiner's objections. Applicant reserves the right to pursue any of the deleted subject matter in a further continuation, continuation-in-part or divisional application. The amendment does not contain new matter and its entry is respectfully requested.

The Official Action dated December 15, 2003 has been carefully considered. It is believed that the amended specification and the following comments represent a complete response to the Examiner's rejections and place the present application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### **35 U.S.C. §102**

The Examiner has objected to claims 1, 3, 5-7, 11 and 13-19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Willmitzer et al. (WO 92/01042).

By the present amendment, independent claims 1 and 17 have been amended in order to incorporate the subject matter of previous claim 20 which has been deleted. We note that previous claim 20 was not under objection and therefore amended claims 1 and 17 and the claims dependent thereon are novel. In particular, Willmitzer does not disclose the method of isolating chymosin from plant seed as described in step (d) of these claims.

Claim 1 has also been amended to remove the requirement that the seed contains at least 0.5% (w/w) chymosin as the Examiner feels the percentage yield is not a distinguishing feature of the claims over Willmitzer.

In view of the foregoing, we respectfully request that the objections to the claims under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 09/643,755  
Amdt. Dated  
Reply to Office action of December 16, 2003

### **35 U.S.C. §103**

The Examiner has objected to claims 1-8, 10, 11 and 13-23 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Willmitzer et al. and further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art.

As mentioned above, the independent method claims 1 and 17 have now been amended in order to include steps for isolating the chymosin from the plant seed. The steps involve fractionating crushed seed into an oil fraction, an aqueous fraction and a fraction comprising insoluble material and then subsequently contacting the aqueous fraction containing the chymosin with a protein binding resin. None of these steps are disclosed or suggested in Willmitzer. Further, one of skill in the art would not be motivated to include such steps having read Willmitzer for the following reasons.

First, as Willmitzer does not prepare chymosin in seed, Willmitzer does not isolate chymosin from seed. Willmitzer uses a constitutive promoter which results in the expression of chymosin in various plant parts and Willmitzer isolates the chymosin from the leaves. Second, Willmitzer does not prepare chymosin in plants containing high levels of oil. Willmitzer only works in tobacco and potato plants. Consequently, Willmitzer would provide no motivation for one of skill in the art to develop methods to isolate chymosin from oil seeds.

At the time that the invention, recombinant proteins had been prepared in oil seeds. However, the purification of recombination proteins from oil seeds was difficult due to the presence of large quantities of oil which would make the subsequent purification steps problematic. The art-recognized solution to the problem was to extract the oil using conventional hexane extraction procedures. However, the use of hexane or other organics solvents to extract proteins was not desirable due to the denaturant property of such solvents. We are enclosing a paper by Cramer et al. (*Current Topics in Microbiology and Immunology*, Vol. 240, p. 95-118, 1999) which states at page 107 that "methods of efficiently recovering proteins from the apoplastic fluid have yet to be developed".

Appl. No. 09/643,755  
Amdt. Dated  
Reply to Office action of December 16, 2003

The problems of the prior art were solved by the present invention. In particular, the present inventors determined that chymosin could be recovered by fractionating the crushed plant seed into an oil fraction, an aqueous fraction and a fraction comprising insoluble material using an aqueous extraction protocol. Organic solvents are not required which overcomes the disadvantages of the prior art.

In view of the above, the claims of the present invention are inventive over Willmitzer as Willmitzer provides no disclosure, suggestion or motivation to isolate the chymosin from plant seeds using aqueous extraction. We do not understand the Examiner's statement on page 7 of the office action that states that "Willmitzer teaches methods of protein isolation using a protein binding resin". Respectfully, we cannot find any disclosure in Willmitzer that relates to the use of a protein binding resin.

The Examiner has also objected to claims 1-8 and 10-23 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Willmitzer and further in view of Adang et al. (U.S. 5,380,831).

As mentioned previously, the independent claims have now been amended in order to include steps for isolating the chymosin from the seed. The claims are clearly inventive over Willmitzer for the reasons stated above. The deficiencies in Willmitzer are in no way remedied by Adang as Adang is not concerned with methods of preparing chymosin in plant seeds and with methods of isolating the chymosin from the plant seeds.

In view of the foregoing, we respectfully request that all of the objections to the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees (including any claim fees) or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 02-2095.

Appl. No. 09/643,755  
Amdt. Dated  
Reply to Office action of December 16, 2003

In view of the foregoing, we submit that the application is in order for allowance and an early indication to that effect would be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

BERESKIN & PARR

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Micheline Gravelle  
Reg. No. 40,261

Bereskin & Parr  
Box 401, 40 King Street West  
Toronto, Ontario  
Canada M5H 3Y2  
Tel: 416-957-1682  
Fax: 416-361-1398

Attachments

## Transgenic Plants for Therapeutic Proteins: Linking Upstream and Downstream Strategies

C.L. CHAMBERLAIN<sup>1</sup>, J.G. BOOTH<sup>2</sup>, and K.K. OSENI<sup>3</sup>

1 Introduction	95
2 Plant-Based Biopharmaceutical Production: Issues and Answers	99
2.1 Selection of Crop Species	100
2.2 Choice of Tissue	101
2.3 Expression Strategies	101
2.4 Posttranslational Processing	105
2.5 Recovery Strategies	105
2.5.1 Affinity Tag-Based Purification	105
2.5.2 Chromatography	106
2.5.3 Small Scale Purification Tools	107
3 Strategies of Plant-Synthesized Protein Therapeutics: Linking Upstream and Downstream Strategies	108
3.1 Production of Human Cytoskeletal Enzymes in <i>Nicotiana glauca</i>	109
3.2 Production of Human Cytoskeletal Enzymes in <i>Nicotiana glauca</i>	112
3.2.1 Prospects of Chloroplast Biotechnology	113
4 Summary	114
References	115

### 1 Introduction

With the new knowledge generated through the Human Genome Project and related biomedical research comes a potential revolution in drug development strategies. One of the most direct applications of this knowledge will be highly specialized recombinant protein-based therapeutics. Recombinant drugs such as human erythropoietin (EPO), tissue plasminogen activator (tPA), and Oxyzyme<sup>TM</sup> (glucosyltransferase) are currently on the market and many other recombinant proteins are in various stages of human clinical trials. Commercial production of

<sup>1</sup> CropTech Corp., Virginia Tech. Corporate Research Center, Blacksburg, VA, 24060 and Department of Plant Pathology, Physiology and Weed Science, Fralin Biotechnology Center, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA 24061-0344, USA

<sup>2</sup> Bas BioPharm Canada Inc., Suite 204, 669 14th St. N.W., Calgary, Alberta T2N 2C6, Canada

<sup>3</sup> CropTech Corp., Virginia Tech Corporate Research Center, Blacksburg, VA, 24060, USA


Reprint from

Current Topics in Microbiology and Immunology, Vol. 240  
Plant Biotechnology: New Products and Applications

Editors: J. Hammond, P. McGarvey, and V. Yusibov

© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 1999

Printed in Germany. Not for Sale.

 Springer

These proteins utilize fermentation (primarily *E. coli* and yeast) and mammalian cell systems (e.g., Chinese hamster ovary cells), the major expression systems developed by the well established biotechnology companies. However, these expression systems have significant limitations. Bacteria cannot perform the complex posttranslational modifications required for bioactivity of many human proteins and high-level expression often leads to accumulation of insoluble protein aggregates. While mammalian cell cultures perform the required protein modifications, low transgene expression levels, instability of selected cell lines, and the difficulties and high expense of scaling up are often limiting or severely impact cost. Thus, there is a need for alternative expression systems that address these limitations and cost issues to compete in the protein therapeutics market. In fact, development of more cost-effective protein bioproduction systems may be critical in translating the discoveries of genomics and medical research into widely available and affordable treatments and cures. Recent advances in the area of genetically engineered plants and animals for bioproduction of pharmaceuticals represent a great source as effective protein factories. The fact that recombinant protein from both transgenic animals and transgenic plants are now in clinical trials demonstrates significant progress toward commercialization of these technologies.

For any particular target protein, selection of a recombinant system will depend on the characteristics of the desired protein product, the volume needs (size of the market), and market-driven cost constraints (reviewed by Pao 1996). Transgenic plants have some remarkable features that make them particularly well suited for cost-effective bioproduction of proteins for pharmaceutical uses. These include: (a) low production costs, (b) reduced time to market, (c) unlimited supply, (d) enzymatic protein processing, and (e) safety. Cost advantages are based not only on the low cost of biomass production, but also costs associated with research and development, periplasm scale-up (e.g., imagine the infrastructure investment of tripling the capacity of one's aseptic fermentation or mammalian cell production facility compared to tripling one's acreage for plant growth), and reduced requirements for quality assurance testing for exclusion of human pathogenic agents (reviewed in Oweri and Pao 1996). Plant-based strategies also have advantages in the scale at which feasibility testing can be done and R & D successes can be scaled up and brought to market. For example, a tobacco plant goes from seed to seed germination seed in three months and produces up to a million seed per plant. Scaling up to hundreds or thousands of acres is very rapid.

Many of the therapeutic proteins of interest require complex posttranslational modification and/or oligomerization for bioactivity or appropriate targeting following administration to patients. There appears to be remarkable conservation of these protein processing steps between plants and animals such that the majority of secreted proteins that have been produced in plants (see Table 1) show significant structural, biochemical, and functional equivalency to proteins from humans or animal cell cultures. In cases where certain modification steps are lacking or differ in plants (e.g., glycan composition, discussed further below), strategies to introduce appropriate animal protein processing enzymes or modify the plant processing machinery are being developed.

Transgenic Plants for Therapeutic Protein: Linking Upstream and Downstream Strategies 377

Table 1. Fidelity of plant-based products of human (or other animal) proteins

Transgene product	Potential use disease target	Plant host	Structural integrity	Functional activity	Reference
Antisense proteinase inhibitor	Blood endothelia	Tobacco	Yes (glucosyl)	Yes (O <sub>2</sub> CD <sub>2</sub> binding)	Dussanve et al. 1997
Transgenic serum albumin	Blood endothelia	Poplar	Yes	Not tested	Singore et al. 1990
Protein C	Anticoagulant	Tobacco	Most regions	Not tested	Chen et al. 1996
Proteinase inhibitors	Viral proteasome and chaper	Poplar	Yes	Yes (Viral resistance assay)	Zure et al. 1994
Plant defensin	Phytophthora pathogen	Tobacco	Yes	Yes (in vitro assay)	Gant 1997
GM-CSF	Leukocytes in local stress transplant	Tobacco	Yes (glycan <sup>a</sup> )	Yes (growth stimul., TF-1 cells)	Quise et al. 1995
Exopolysaccharide growth factor	Antibiotic	Tobacco	CRIM <sup>b</sup>	Not tested	Hoo et al. 1993
Tobacco growth factor	Mitogen	Tobacco	Yes	Not tested	Bosch et al. 1994
Epidermal growth factor	Mitogen, blood cells	Tobacco	Yes (glycan <sup>a</sup> )	Not tested	Marmiroto et al. 1995
Epidermal growth factor inhibitor	Fatty disease	Tobacco	Yes (glycan <sup>a</sup> )	Yes (enzyme act.)	GALL 1997
glycosylated enzymes α-Galactosidase	Glucosaminoglycan disease	Tobacco	Yes (glycan <sup>a</sup> )	Yes (enzyme act.)	Chabun et al. 1996b
Plant proteinase inhibitor	Neurological	Poplar	CRIM <sup>b</sup>	Not tested	Chen et al. 1997
Humanin	Anticoagulant	Onion	Yes	Yes (thrombin inhib.)	Panamaritz et al. 1995
NP1 defensin	Antibiotic	Tobacco	CRIM <sup>b</sup>	Yes (antibiotic act.)	Quise 1997
Glucanase deacetylase	Diabetes	Tobacco	CRIM <sup>b</sup>	Yes (mouse model)	Ma et al. 1997

Proteins were glycosylated for the glycan composition may differ from those produced in humans.

Proteins were glycosylated by the glycan composition may differ from those produced in *Escherichia coli*. Detected as cross-reactive immunoprecipitated by western immunoblot or ELISA.

mechanism are greatly facilitated by the ease of plant transformation and the broad experience in transgenic approaches to modifying plant metabolism through overexpression and antisense strategies. In fact, plants may be the only system capable of efficient production of certain human proteins such as growth regulators and cell cycle inhibitors which would negatively impact either the transgenic animal or animal cell culture in which they are expressed.

Perhaps the most important advantage of plants, which is emerging in the aftermath of this recent "mad cow disease" scare, involves product safety. The biopharmaceutical industry is now faced with the possibility of product validation





issues of recovery, purity, production/purification costs, reproducibility, supply continuity, quality control, and regulatory assessment.

## 2.1 Selection of Crop Species

While certain features such as low production costs and high biomass capacity are common to all plant-based expression systems, other factors may strongly influence the choice of one plant species or expression strategy over another for the production of a specific foreign protein. In selecting a particular species it is important to consider how readily it can be manipulated to produce a stable transgenic line, the tissue and subcellular compartment best suited for stable expression of the heterologous protein, and the availability of methods for the efficient harvesting and initial processing of the plant material. Included in the first consideration are factors such as the amenability to transformation and regeneration of whole plants, generation time, and tractability to controlled genetic crossing. All of these factors significantly impact upon the time and resources required for product development. Plant transformation technologies are highlighted in other chapters (Hansen and Chilton and Flier et al., this volume) and have been recently reviewed (Lancaster 1996) and are therefore not discussed in detail here. The remaining two considerations deal mainly with product biocompatibility (toxicity, contamination, efficacy) and recovery. Because infrastructure and methods for the harvest and processing of the major crop species already exist, whenever possible these are the species of choice. The tissue and subcellular compartment of expression determines protein processing capabilities, stability of the product and the ease with which it can be recovered.

Tobacco remains the easiest plant to genetically engineer and is widely used to test suitability of plant-based systems for bioproduction of recombinant proteins (see Table 2). Although tobacco is considered a regional crop and relatively labor intensive, at least three plant-based biotech companies are targeting tobacco for biopharmaceutical production (CropTech Corp., BioSource Technologies, Inc. and Plant Biotechnology). In addition to being easily engineered, tobacco is an excellent biomass producer (in excess of 40 tons leaf fresh weight/acre based on multiple harvests per season) and produces seed products (up to one million seeds produced per plant), thus hastening the time in which a product can be scaled up and brought to market.

Several companies are developing production strategies involving transgenic product accumulation in seeds, an organ designed to accumulate and store protein reserves (see Sect. 2.2). Companies targeting seed-based production using canola, corn or soybeans include Sem BioSys Genetics, Agracetus (USA), Morgan International (the Netherlands), and Plantzyme (the Netherlands). Applied Phytologies (API, Davis, CA) is using transgenic rice and barley seed but is producing and recovering recombinant proteins during seed germination in a process analogous to malting. Other crops being developed for biopharmaceutical protein or vaccine production include alfalfa, banana, potato, and tomato.

## 2.2 Choice of Tissue

In order to obtain maximum yield, the plant species selected must concentrate biomass in the organ or tissue where the foreign protein is expressed. The diversity among different species in this respect means that a variety of options are available including leaves, vegetative storage organs (e.g. tubers) and seeds. The tissues chosen should be compatible with the desired protein, enabling correct processing, stable accumulation and, whenever possible, efficient recovery. Many human therapeutic proteins require extensive processing for full activity, involving transport through the cellular endomembrane system. Functional lysosomal enzymes (Czerniak et al. 1996b) and animal antibodies (DA et al. 1995) have all been produced in leaves of tobacco following trafficking through the endoplasmic reticulum (ER) and Golgi complex. Human serum albumin has also been stably expressed in tobacco leaves and various tissues of potato including tubers (Simmons et al. 1999), although the precise folding and functionality of the protein was not established. In the above examples the recombinant proteins were either specifically targeted to, and detected in the cytoplasm, or presented to locate there as a result of the default pathway of the plant endomembrane system. Deposition into the extracellular space may contribute to the stability of foreign proteins by removing them from the more hydrophilic intracellular environment (Flier et al. 1993).

Expression and accumulation of foreign proteins in seeds may be achieved through compartmentalization within various subcellular storage organelles. As a natural storage organ, seeds possess attributes such as high protein content and a low hydrolytic intracellular environment that make them particularly attractive as protein production vehicles. The human penicillinase, lat-exenkephalin (Vasanthakumari et al. 1989), and the seed storage protein, legumin (Pausanias et al. 1995), have both been produced in seeds of *Brassica napus* following targeting to protein bodies and oil bodies respectively. Protein can also be secreted in the apoplast of seeds. However, the recovery of apoplastic proteins from seeds may be more difficult than from those of the vegetative organs mentioned above, owing to the desiccated state of seed tissues at maturity. On the other hand, this advanced state of desiccation also confers enhanced stability, allowing seeds to be stored for periods of several years without any appreciable degradation of protein or loss of activity (e.g. see Flier et al. 1993). The greater stability resulting from the separation of protein production and purification represents a distinct advantage of seeds over most other organs for which more immediate processing is often required.

## 2.3 Expression Strategies

Choice of promoter, which mediates the timing, tissue-specificity, and level of transgene expression, is a key determinant of transgene product yield and recovery strategies (see review by Cawston and Cowan 1996). As shown in Table 2, many of the human (or other animal) proteins expressed in plants have used native or enhanced

versions of the 35S promoter derived from the cauliflower mosaic virus to drive "constitutive" transgene expression, and it remains the most widely used promoter in plant biology for over-expression of plant proteins or inhibition via antisense strategies. The 35S promoter is active in most plant tissues (Beverly et al. 1989; Fawcett et al. 1993) and especially in its modified forms (Lay et al. 1983; Cameron and Drenth 1990) can drive quite high levels of protein production. Although most of the human proteins produced using the 35S promoter (Table 2) showed accumulation levels below 0.1% of soluble protein, several transgene products (alkaline phosphatase, arabinoside) have been expressed at levels of 2%-5% of extractable protein. The 35S promoter is quite active during seed development and has been used in production systems targeting recovery of recombinant protein from seed. However, the 35S promoter (and constitutive expression in general) has significant limitations when commercial bioproduction in nonseed tissues is the goal. Proteins that accumulate to high levels may negatively impact yield or overall health of the plant. High constitutive expression is sometimes associated with co-suppression or gene silencing (Taylor 1997) resulting in little or no transgene product accumulation. For proteins that are not highly stable, constitutive expression can lead to vast wastage-degradation cycles and, of particular detriment for pharmaceutical application, accumulation of the final product with inactive degradation products. In addition, the 35S is not highly active in many mature tissues (e.g., mature roots and fully expanded leaves) so that the full potential of biomass cannot be utilized. Use of inducible promoters or promoters that have a tight pattern of tissue- or organ-specificity avoids many of these limitations and appears to be the strategy of choice for most complex targeting plant-based production of high-value proteins.

GenVec scientists have developed a postharvest expression system that uses an inducible promoter termed the MeGA™ promoter (Clausen and Wiersma 1990). This promoter has been modified from a defense-related gene such that it is generally inactive during normal growth and development but shows rapid and strong gene activation in response to mechanical stress (wound-injection, or mechanical gene activation) or a variety of defense elicitors. Thus, the recombinant protein is not synthesized in tobacco leaves in the field (or greenhouse). Plants can be harvested and stored for weeks in a cold room. Recombinant protein production is then induced, *de novo*, in the laboratory or GMP facility and newly synthesized protein recovered 6-24 hr. Because survival depends on both the speed and intensity with which a plant can activate its defenses, we find the MeGA™ promoter highly effective in driving high levels of inducible expression in all tissues of the plant including fully expanded leaves. The postharvest expression strategy has several advantages for pharmaceutical production. Biomass production is both temporally and spatially separated from recombinant product production minimizing the impact of (a) environmental factors on protein yield and quality and (b) possible deleterious effects of transgene expression or foreign protein accumulation on plant growth and development. All recovered protein is newly synthesized. In addition, the timing of protein extraction can be adjusted based on the stability of the particular gene product to optimize yield of fully active polypep-

tides. For products requiring activation of multiple genes (e.g., multiple subunits, or target proteins that require specialized protein-modifying enzymes), cotransfection of target proteins that require specialized protein-modifying enzymes could also permit accurate coordinated synthesis. In theory, the postharvest system could also permit further manipulation of the protein synthesis and processing machinery through addition of specific chemicals to the infiltration medium (e.g., inhibitors of key protein modifying steps), although this could add significant expense to commercial scale bioproduction.

Bioproduction strategies involving developmentally defined or vitally vector-mediated expression (e.g., Bioscience's Gateway system) are also designed to limit recombinant protein production to a discrete period. With the Gateway system, TMV-infectible tobacco is held grown to an appropriate age, inoculated with genetically modified virus, and harvested 2-3 weeks later for recombinant protein extraction (Ortiz 1997). Within this period, the virus offers reach high levels leading to significant transgene product accumulation. Using this system, Bioscience scientists have attained very high product yields (recombinant protein representing greater than 10% of total soluble protein) and have progressed to the point of large scale seed production and pilot plant extraction. Applied Phytobiology utilizes a germination-specific promoter to direct transgene expression. Recombinant protein is produced under controlled conditions following inhibition and initiation of germination of transgenic seed, a production scheme analogous to barley mashing. Expression strategies involving seed-based accumulation of recombinant proteins also take advantage of discrete bioproduction periods and expansion of transgene activity from the bulk of plant growth. A large number of seed-specific promoters, often derived from genes encoding seed storage proteins, are available for both monocot and dicot plants. Depending on the recovery strategy (see below) and the characteristics of the protein product, promoters specific for embryo versus endosperm-specific expression can be selected.

## 2.4 Posttranslational Processing

In combination with industrial enzyme production, bioproduction of human proteins for pharmaceutical applications is particularly challenging due to the rigorous requirements with respect to purity, reproducibility, efficacy, and bioavailability. Many of the proteins with greatest promise as therapeutics require complex post-translational modifications and/or assembly. The striking fidelity with which plants appear to recognize and correctly act upon most of the processing signals encoded within mammalian polypeptides indicates a high degree of conservation in protein processing machinery between plants and animals. Conserved processes include endomembrane targeting, signal peptide cleavage, protein folding and oligomerization, disulfide bond formation (although precise cysteine-cysteine bonding patterns have not been directly determined), asparagine-linked glycosylation, selective retention in the ER and Golgi, and C-terminal isoprenylation. We have also noted internal proteolytic processing events in several human proteins expressed in tobacco that appear to mimic processing that occurs in mammalian cells

although the precise termini of the polypeptides have not yet been determined (Olsch et al., unpublished data).

However, clear differences in protein processing, most notably in glycoprotein processing, do exist between plants and animals. The glycan moiety of mammalian glycoproteins functions in protein folding and assembly, subcellular targeting, cell or tissue-specific delivery within the body, protein half-life, and clearance from the bloodstream (Varki 1993). Thus, changes in glycan composition or arrangement are likely to affect activity of glycoproteins (Jennings et al. 1996; Lee 1992). Plant N-linked glycans do not contain terminal sialic acid residues or mannose-6-phosphate and contain oligo or sugar linkages not found in mammalian glycoproteins. The sialic acid residue (N-X-S/T) is recognized within the ER for addition of the high-mannose form glycan complex (identical in plant and animals). However, plants possess these N-linked glycans in distinct complex forms as the glycoprotein progresses through the Golgi. The sialic acid is present as the terminal sugar on many serum glycoproteins and appears to function in serum longevity and rates of clearance for some serum proteins (Gruenewald et al. 1991). Incorporation of this charged sugar residue into protein glycans has not been demonstrated in plants (Farr et al. 1989). In addition, plants do not phosphorylate high-mannose glycans - in mammals, the mannose-6-phosphate serves as a signal to target soluble glycoproteins to lysosomes. Finally, many complex plant glycans contain either fucose or xylose residues with linkages that do not occur in humans. Plant-synthesized glycoproteins displaying these sugar linkages appear highly immunogenic when injected into mammals (Chambers and Faye 1996). Interestingly, an Antibodies mutant defective in *N*-acetylglucosaminyl-transferase-1 has been identified in which all N-linked glycans are in the high-mannose form (von Schwanen et al. 1993). This report suggests that processing of glycans to complex forms is not critical for plant viability or development (in contrast to animals). Thus, plants can be altered to produce nonimmunogenic glycans. Variations in glycan composition is not unique to plant-based recombinant systems - yeast, baculovirus/insect cell, transgenic animal milk and even mammalian cell cultures often generate glycans that are heterogeneous or differ significantly from the native conformation for particular human proteins (reviewed in Vargne et al. 1996). It is clear that additional research is required for effective bioproduction of human glycoproteins in plants (discussed further for lysosomal proteins in Sect. 3). Genetic engineering strategies to modify the glycan-processing machinery of plants or *in vitro* enzymatic modification of the purified recombinant protein should enable commercialization of plant-synthesized glycoproteins for pharmaceutical applications.

Because plants are relatively easy to genetically engineer, genetic strategies to specifically alter protein processing by either antisense to block endogenous enzymes or addition of genes encoding novel processing activities are highly feasible. The recent cloning of plant genes encoding enzymes involved in Golgi-localized glycan processing opens up opportunities to modify the complex glycans produced in plants. Processes other than glycosylation can also be modified. We are interested in testing whether plants can be engineered to produce the complex serum proteins involved in the coagulation-anticoagulation cascade (Chambers

et al. 1996; Weissmuller et al. 1995). Plants are unlikely to perform the highly specialized  $\gamma$ -carboxylation of the amino-terminal glutamates required for biosynthesis of several of these enzymes (prothrombin, fibrinogen, factors VII, IX, and XI). We are currently introducing a human cDNA for the vitamin K-dependent modification to perform the necessary modifications for this class of proteins into tobacco (Chambers, Graham, et al. unpublished data). While these experiments are in very early stages, the concept of engineering elite plant lines for specialized protein processing for pharmaceutical bioproduction seems highly feasible.

## 2.5 Recovery Strategies

To capitalize on the advantages of plant-based systems in upstream production, it is necessary that downstream purification of the recombinant product be accomplished economically. Complex and inefficient purification schemes can contribute significantly to overall costs and result in lower yields of that commercial product. In no longer viable. In some cases, such as in the production of industrial enzymes, downstream costs can be reduced or even eliminated when a high degree of product purity is not required. A good example of this is the production of phytase in seeds. The enzyme phytase may be used to enhance the nutritional quality of seed meal by breaking down the phytase present in the meal and thereby increasing the availability of phosphate to monogastric animals. This may be conveniently achieved through expressing the phytase enzyme in seeds and adding milled transgenic seed to a standard feed meal preparation (Pan et al. 1993; Viswanathan and Pan 1990). Unfortunately, this strategy is not applicable to many proteins, particularly pharmaceutical proteins, that require rigorous purification to near-homogeneity. For these products simple and efficient methods of downstream purification must be developed.

### 2.5.1 Affinity Tag-Based Purification

One approach to the purification of recombinant proteins is through the use of affinity tags. This can be accomplished through the creation of a fusion between the protein of interest and another protein or peptide that exhibits affinity for a specific ligand. The fusion protein is then recovered by binding to the ligand immobilized onto a support matrix. The high selectivity possible with affinity separation often enables a substantial degree of purification to be achieved in a single step. A number of these affinity tags have been developed for use in microbial systems. Different types of ligand pairs have been exploited for this purpose including maltose binding protein-enzyme, histidine residues-metal ions, and protein A-IgG. A similar approach may be useful for the purification of recombinant proteins synthesized in plants. The efficacy of this method in plants has been demonstrated in a small scale purification of a human glucocorticoid-binding protein epitope fusion produced in tobacco (Chambers et al. 1995b). Here, the fusion protein was recovered using an anti-FLAG antibody affinity matrix and used for bio-

from the tobacco pathogenesis-related protein, PR-5, have been used to successfully direct secretion of human serum albumin in potato (Simoes et al. 1996). Similarly, the potato protease inhibitor II protein (pin1) (Hirayama et al. 1993) has been used to secrete  $\alpha$ -glucosidase into the apoplast space of tobacco plants. While the secretion of albumin of the recombinant protein can be achieved with this approach, methods of efficiently recovering protein from the apoplast and its use yet to be developed.

With the appropriate supply of fission it is also possible to target protein to the lumen of the ER or vacuole. The human neutrophilic leukoelastin has been expressed in each of *Arachis hypogaea* and *Drosophila* using an internal fusion between the N<sub>1</sub> and C-terminal ends of the *Arthropod* 2S albumin protein (Vasconcelos et al. 1989). The fusion fusion was subsequently found to accumulate solely within the protein bodies of these seeds. Purification was accomplished through initial fractionation in low salt to obtain albumin protein followed by two proteolytic cleavage steps and HPLC separation. Our first look of this strategy is the complexity of the proteolytic cleavage, particularly since carboxypeptidase was required to remove the C-terminal portion of the albumin protein. A future to precisely control this reaction would result in significant product heterogeneity. It is also possible that folding constraints for protein body processing might impose limitations on the size of the foreign protein that could be produced as an internal fusion.

Nest of podocytes represent another intracellular compartment available for an action of recombinant protein. Localization of the podocyte is achieved through creating a barrier between the luminal extracellular matrix and cytosol, a protein specifically targeted to these organelles. As described below, all podocytes offer some unique advantages and opportunities for expression and purification of foreign proteins.

### 2.5.3. Seed Oil Bodies and Purification Tools

Oil bodies are an unusual non-cellular organelle found in all oleiferous seeds where they form the major storage site for the primary energy source in these seeds, triacylglycerols, the digestion of which for the primary energy source requires the presence of the oil bodies (TALbot, 1990). They are composed of TAGs surrounded by a bulk-skin phospholipid monolayer membrane into which is embedded a unique type of protein known as oleosin (JONES *et al.*, 1990). Oleosins accumulate to high levels in oil seeds comprising between 2% and 10% of the total seed protein in different species. It is believed that the primary function of oleosins is to prevent the coalescence of oil bodies during seed desiccation. In so doing, a larger surface area is available for hydrolytic enzymes enabling the rapid mobilization of TAG reserves upon seed germination. Although the precise mechanism of oleosin targeting is not fully understood, it is known that they are synthesized on the ER and that a motif in the central domain is crucial for their subsequent localization to oil bodies (VAN ROOZEN and McALONEY 1993a, ASSELL *et al.*, 1997). The oleosin protein appears to consist of three distinct domains. The N- and C-terminal domains are amphipathic and proteolytic digestion studies strongly suggest that they reside on the outer surface of the oil body (ASSELL *et al.*, 1997). The central domain is hydrophilic and is believed to be responsible for the

chemical analysis of activity and posttranslational modifications. However, because the long-term application is as a replacement enzyme therapeutically for Gaucher patients, the presence of the "contaminant" residues is undesirable and is not used for scale-up. For some proteins and production strategies, the affinity tag can be removed or partially removed from the fusion protein following purification. However, as with any enzyme, the long-term cleavage of fusion proteins has additional steps required. It is unclear how this contributes to the downstream purification cost. But there is the potential that the tag could alter folding or processing of the recombinant protein.

### 2.5.2 Comparison Calculation

Another means of simplifying the purification of recombinant proteins is through coprecipitation. This can be achieved using either small peptides or whole proteins known to target the protein to a specific cellular location. In this case, the purification of the desired protein is facilitated by virtue of its physical association with a class present in the cell. Subcellular fractionation is then used to obtain the purified fraction and contains the recombinant protein. A variety of forms of coprecipitation have been reported for the production of foreign proteins in *E. coli* strains. These include coexpression of viral particles, extracellular secretion, and an affinity to intracellular storage organelles. As noted above, the physiological modification of the protein required to produce a functional protein necessarily contrasts with that required for storage, as these reactions take in a large extent, localized in specific subcellular compartments.

[illegible]

Secretion into the extracellular media or periplasmic space has proven to be extremely useful for production and purification of foreign proteins in many yeast and bacterial systems. In addition to providing an enriched fraction of the recombinant product, secretion has also been found to enhance protein stability and facilitate proper folding. Another attractive feature of this approach is that the signal peptide is removed from the recombinant protein in the course of normal processing, enabling an authentic protein to be obtained without introducing additional proteolytic digestion steps. In plant cells, secreted proteins are deposited into the apoplastic space. The native signal peptide as well as a signal sequence located on the apoplastic space.

### 3.1 Production of Human Lysosomal Enzymes in *Nicotiana glauca*

Considerable production of recombinant human proteins for replacement enzyme therapies is likely to have a huge impact on the care and treatment of patients with specific metabolic or genetic disorders. The lysosomal storage disorders represent a large class of these genetic diseases for which the molecular basis of disease has been determined and DNA screening for the required enzymes have been done (Naidu et al., 1993). Lysosomes, the cellular organelle responsible for the regulated intracellular degradation of macromolecules, contain multiple hydrolytic including proteases, nucleases, glycosidases, lipases, phosphatases, phospholipases, and sulfatases (Dawson et al., 1985). Defects in specific lysosomal hydrolytic enzymes can lead to toxic accumulation of the undegraded substrate and a variety of clinical manifestations. Tay-Sachs disease is perhaps the most familiar lysosomal storage disease, involving deficiencies in catabolism of the most abundant lysosomal storage disaccharide, GM2, in the membranes of brain cells (Naidu et al., 1993). This rare deficiency of one of more of the ten lysosomal enzymes required for the degradation of sulfated glycosaminoglycans (mucopolysaccharides) is known as Hurler's and Hunter's syndromes. Lysosomal accumulation of undegraded glycans leads to the malfunction of affected cells/organs which compromises the growth and development of the individual and may, in severe cases, lead to premature death. Replacement enzyme therapy appears promising based on human cell- and animal models, but drug development is hampered by the small patient pool and limitation in current technologies for cost-effective bioproduction. The industry paradigm for human replacement enzyme therapy is the glycoprotein product Ceredase (Genzyme, Cambridge, MA) for the treatment of Gaucher disease. This lysosomal storage disorder affects 10,000-20,000 individuals in the United States (NIH Technology Assessment Panel on Gaucher Disease 1996) and is caused by defects in glucocerebrosidase, an acid  $\beta$ -glucosidase required for complex lipid degradation. Routine administration (generally every 2 weeks) of placental-derived enzyme has revolutionized the treatment of the disease and the quality of life of Gaucher patients. However, the high drug cost associated with purification of glycosylated enzymes from human placenta or, more recently, with bioproduction of recombinant enzyme in Chinese hamster ovary (CHO) cells, make it one of the world's most expensive drugs. Although the production of lysosomal enzymes in plants is challenging (Cubero et al., 1996b), Crop Tech has achieved several lysosomal enzymes, among its initial targets, for bioproduction based on (a) the ability of plants to achieve critical cost, safety and supply issues for replacement enzymes, (b) the extreme medical need, and (c) the potential for Orphan Drug status to facilitate progress toward clinical trials and commercialization.

The first lysosomal enzyme produced in transgenic plants was glucosylase (Cubero et al., 1996a,b). Placental glucocerebrosidase that has been enzymatically modified to generate mannose-terminated glycans is highly effective in

1997; Hiltz et al., 1993; Tzen and Huang 1992). The central domain is comprised largely of hydrophobic amino acid residues, and is believed to adopt a hairpin conformation anchoring the protein firmly within the TAG core of the oil body. Comparison of oleosin sequences from different species reveals that the central domain is highly conserved while the N- and C-terminal exhibit considerable sequence variation.

Several features of seed oil bodies lend themselves to the production of foreign proteins. Oleosins facilitate fusion of foreign proteins to either the N- or C-terminal ends without apparent loss of oil body targeting efficiency (Macosko and van Rooyen, 1996). Oleosin fusions have been created with a number of different proteins varying in molecular weight from approximately 7-55 kDa, all of which are stably accumulated on the surface of oil bodies. In the case of the reporter enzyme  $\beta$ -glucuronidase, it was further shown that enzymatic activity was retained with the oleosin fusion-oil body complex. The oil bodies, together with their complement of oleosin proteins, are remarkably stable both within the seed and following their release in aqueous solution (van Rooyen and Macosko, 1995b). Within the seed the proteins remain undegraded for years without the requirement for abnormal storage conditions. Following their release into aqueous solution, oil bodies are extremely resistant to mechanical disruption and are stable over a wide range in pH and temperature (Kubicek et al., 1995; van Rooyen and Macosko, 1993). Finally, the lower density of oil bodies allows them to be separated from soluble contaminants by flotation centrifugation, enabling simple and rapid purification of recombinant proteins targeted to the oil body surface. Digestion with a site-specific endoprotease to cleave the oleosin fusion protein, and centrifugation to remove the oil bodies, results in the recovery of a highly purified fraction of the desired recombinant protein within the aqueous phase. The naturally low hydrolytic environment within the seed, coupled with the rapid removal of soluble protein contaminants, ensures that little or no degradation of the oil body-associated proteins occurs during processing. As described in Sect. 3.2, the unique properties of oleosins and oil bodies have been exploited by Sanofi-Synthelabo in the development of a novel plant-based protein production and purification system.

### 3 Examples of Plant-Synthesized Protein Therapeutics: Linking Upstream and Downstream Strategies

In order to "reduce to practice" many of the innovations and strategies described above, two very different examples of plant-based bioproduction of recombinant proteins of commercial value are described below. These examples not only demonstrate the diversity of expression and purification strategies available through plants, but also highlight the constraints on bioproduction strategies imposed by the particular protein target. In both cases, the overall bioproduction strategy has been strongly influenced by commercial and regulatory considerations.



present on the placental enzymes are blastocyst structures having terminal steric residues. In order to direct effective delivery to lysosomes of the affected cells in Gaucher patients (primarily cells of the macrophage/monocyte lineage), sequential enzymatic digestion is used to remove the terminal sugars and expose the mannose core (Barton et al. 1991). This mannose-terminating form is targeted to the correct cell and organelle location to effect glucocerebrosidase degradation and symptom resolution (Gawronski et al. 1995; Barton et al. 1991). Complex plant glycans are naturally mannose terminated (Christians and Fierz 1996). Enzymatic removal of the immunogenic fucose and xylose residues should yield glycans of similar pharmacokinetics as Cerezyme.

### 3.2 Production of Hirudin in *Bacillus subtilis*

To evaluate the potential of Sam Biosys' cleasin partitioning technology, the model therapeutic protein hirudin was selected. Hirudin is a naturally occurring anticoagulant protein produced in the salivary glands of medicinal leeches (*Hirudo medicinalis*) and secreted to facilitate feeding. Since its discovery almost 30 years ago, it has been extensively studied. Hirudin possesses a number of desirable properties which advocate its use as a therapeutic pharmaceutical: it is an extremely specific and potent inhibitor of thrombin, the fast enzyme in the blood coagulation cascade, having a  $K_i$  of 2 fM (Bakuni et al. 1988). It is also rapidly cleared from the body, exhibits low toxicity (500,000 IU/kg body weight in rats) (Mazurkiewicz et al. 1992) and, probably as a consequence of the covalent loss of leucine and mannose, has relatively low immunogenicity (Klockstein 1991). The protein has also been well characterized with respect to its structure and mechanism of binding to thrombin (Rybinski et al. 1990). A small number of closely related isoforms of hirudin have been isolated all of which show strict conservation for the cysteine residues (Stoven and Mazurkiewicz 1993). These residues participate in the formation of three disulfide bridges whose precise pairing is necessary for protein activity (Chakraverty and Chakraverty 1992, 1993). Although the native protein is purified at the Ty-63 position, recombinant hemifused hirudin exhibits significant activity (Stoven and Mazurkiewicz 1993). It folds spontaneously *in vitro* and functional hirudin has been produced previously in both bacterial (Hawner et al. 1986; Hawner et al. 1990) and yeast (Lonsky et al. 1988; Lussman et al. 1993) systems. However, the quantities of hirudin required, were it to fully replace presently used anticoagulants such as heparin, are estimated to be on the order of hundreds to thousands of kilograms of protein annually. For this reason, hirudin is an excellent candidate for production with a high capacity plant-based system.

The common oilseed rape species, *Brassica napus*, was selected as the vehicle for production of seed-derived hirudin. After tobacco, the *Brassica* species are among those most easily transformed with *Agrobacterium*. Cells in the end of cotyledonary petioles and from young seedlings are readily infected with the bacterium. Formation of callus, regeneration to plants, and selection of transformants are all very efficient. In *B. napus*, transformation efficiencies approaching 55% of

the original explants can be obtained. The time-line for development of a transgenic plant is also relatively short, in the range of approximately 4–6 months from transformation to collection of first generation transformed seed. Another attractive feature is the availability of a diploid production system from microspore-derived embryos, facilitating the creation of homozygous lines. As an oilseed crop, considerable biomass is concentrated within the seed. Seed production in *B. napus* is between 1 and 2 tons per hectare at a cost of approximately (United States \$) 100/ton. Protein content in these seeds represents in excess of 20% of the total seed weight, approximately 9% of which is oleosin.

The production and analysis of transgenic plants expressing an oleosin-hirudin fusion has been reported previously (Palamarek et al. 1995). Briefly, a synthetic sequence encoding the hirudin variant 2 (HV2) domain was fused to the 3' end of an *A. thaliana* 19kDa oleosin gene with the two coding regions separated by a sequence encoding the four amino acid recognition site for the protease, factor Xa. Following *Agrobacterium*-mediated transformation, putative transformants were selected and expression of the oleosin-hirudin fusion confirmed by northern analysis. Immunoblotting with anti-hirudin antibodies demonstrated that the oleosin-hirudin fusion protein was correctly targeted and accumulated in oil bodies of transgenic seeds. Oil bodies were separated and washed to remove contaminating soluble proteins through flotation-centrifugation. After digestion with factor Xa and a final round of flotation-centrifugation to remove oil bodies, hirudin was recovered in the aqueous fraction. Formation of a functional protein was confirmed by an *in vitro* thrombin inhibition assay. Comparison of protein contents in whole seed extracts and in the soluble fraction obtained after flotation-centrifugation indicated that the majority of seed protein had been removed. The enrichment obtained with this procedure demonstrates the utility of oil body compartmentalization for purification of recombinant proteins. Further purification of the recombinant hirudin to near-homogeneity was achieved through anion exchange and reverse phase chromatography. Values obtained for the specific activity of *B. napus*-derived hirudin are equivalent to those reported for recombinant hirudin produced in yeast systems (Lonsky et al. 1988).

### 3.2.1 Prospects of Oleosin-Partitioning Technology

The potential for commercial application of oleosin partitioning technology can be evaluated by examining the system with reference to several key production parameters namely, production capacity, authenticity/functionality of product, downstream purification costs, and process scalability. We have estimated the level of expression of the oleosin-hirudin fusion protein in our transgenic seed to be approximately 10% of that of the endogenous oleosin (Palamarek et al. 1995). Based on this estimate, hirudin would represent approximately 0.3% of the total seed protein. While encouraging, this level is still somewhat lower than would be desired for a commercial production system. To increase expression levels, we are currently testing a number of strongly seed-specific promoters other than oleosin in our fusion constructs. An increase in the expression of recombinant protein to the relatively

modest level of 1% of seed protein would result in a system capacity of approximately 2kg of product per ton of seed. When coupled with low production costs and cost-effective purification, this level is within the range required for commercial viability.

The downstream purification of proteins synthesized as oleosin fusions is greatly simplified by the oil body separation process. However, in order for this process to be cost-effective, the fusion protein cleavage step must be both efficient and economical. While useful for demonstration purposes, the factor Xa used in our initial hybrid studies fails to meet these requirements. The enzyme is expensive, gave incomplete cleavage, and represented a contaminant which had to be removed in subsequent purification steps. To address this problem we are presently expressing proteases as oleosin fusions immobilized on the surface of oil bodies. This will enable both economical production of the protease and easy removal following fusion protein cleavage through the existing oil body separation process. A number of suitable candidate proteases have been identified and are currently being tested.

The importance of process scale-up in determining economic feasibility is often overlooked in the initial research and development phase of a new technology. Procedures that work well for typical laboratory scale experiments cannot always be directly scaled up or easily adapted to existing industrial processes. In the case of oleosin partitioning technology, we have developed and tested methods using industrial equipment for the large scale preparation of oil bodies. The results from these tests indicate that the process can be easily scaled up to meet commercial production requirements.

The recovery of active products such as lysozyme and  $\beta$ -glucuronidase from oleosin fusions demonstrates that functional proteins can be produced using oleosin partitioning technology. However, the fact that oleosins are not exposed to the lumen of the ER during synthesis or subsequent targeting to oil bodies limits the range of different proteins that can be produced through oleosin partitioning. Proteins requiring glycosylation or other forms of posttranslational modification associated with passage through the endomembrane system would not be properly processed as oleosin fusions. Nevertheless, a large number of proteins are still amenable to production using this technology. In addition to therapeutic proteins, the list includes many food and industrial enzymes. Some of these products are presently under development. Additionally, the ability to produce functional proteins on the surface of oil bodies offers exciting new possibilities for the production of immobilized protein matrices (Kishan et al. 1996). With continued development in each of the areas mentioned above, prospects for the successful commercialization of oleosin partitioning technology appear very promising.

#### 4 Summary

We have described two very different and innovative plant-based production systems - protharvest production and recovery of recombinant product from tobacco

leaves using an inducible promoter and oleosin-mediated recovery of recombinant product from oleosins using a seed-specific promoter. Both basic technologies are broadly applicable to numerous classes of pharmaceutical and industrial proteins. As with any emerging technology, the key to success may lie in identifying those products and applications that would most benefit from the unique advantages offered by each system. The protharvest tobacco leaf system appears effective for proteins requiring complex posttranslational processing and endoplasmic reticulum. Because of the remarkable fecundity and biomass production capacity of tobacco, biomass scale-up is very rapid and production costs are low. Clearly the development of equally cost-effective extraction and purification technologies will be critical for full realization of the commercial opportunities afforded by transgenic plant-based bioproduction. The recovery of protein from tobacco leaves or oleosin-purified proteins by hot-body separations represent significant breakthroughs for cost-effective commercialization strategies. Additional low-cost, high-affinity separation technologies need to be developed for effective scale-up purification of plant-synthesized recombinant proteins. Clearly successful commercialization of plant-synthesized biopharmaceuticals must effectively link upstream strategies involving gene and protein design with downstream strategies for reproducible GMP level recovery of bioactive recombinant protein. Both the tobacco and oilseed systems are uniquely designed to address issues of biomass, storage, protein recovery, quality assurance, and regulatory scrutiny in addition to issues of transgene expression and protein processing.

#### References

- Abel RK, Holbrook LA, Neeley M, Murphy DJ, Ellis DJ, McElroy MD (1997) Role of the proline-rich protein in oleosin subdomains in calcium, lipid, and oil body packaging. *Plant Cell* 9:1463-1473
- Bajbouj NM, Lindy RC, Dambitzi JM, Benschop AM, Dimpfel SR, Ellis DJ, Martin EH, Murphy DJ, Parker RT, Neeley M, Cooper GL, Cooper GL, Ellis DJ (1998) Reproductive therapy of inherited enzyme deficiencies: mucopolysaccharidosis type I (MPS I). *Enzyme* 60:1-10
- Bender E, Vogel R, Kottler K, Beyer J (1999) Synthesis and secretion of lysozyme by *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Appl Microbiol Biotech* 54:203-207
- Bellamy PE, Tang B, Chen M (1997) The CAMV 35S promoter: a review of its use in plant transformation. *Plant Cell Rep* 16:205-210
- Buch D, Siegel J, Krebber E (1994) A virus growth bottleneck is expressed, correctly folded and partially glycosylated in the leaves but not the seed of transgenic plants. *Transgenic Res* 3:304-310
- Brady RO, Penhober FG, Osi AK, Thibert SR, Zolshaban AS (1974) Replacement therapy for inherited enzyme deficiency. Use of purified glucocerebrosidase in Gaucher's disease. *N Engl J Med* 291:989-993
- Radus PJ, Dennis G, Holbrook LA, Sauer SR (1989) Use of the oleosin gene to investigate the basis for the specificity of lysozyme. *Biochemistry* 28:4517-4522
- Carlington AC, Fyfe GD (1999) Cap-independent enhancement of translation by a plant polyprotein 5' nontranslated region. *J Virol* 64:1500-1507
- Chakrabarti B, Chong J (1993) The folding of lysozyme adopts a mechanism of trial and error. *J Biol Chem* 268:3033-3041
- Chakrabarti B, Chong J (1993) The oleosin folding pathway of lysozyme elucidated by coexpression. *J Biol Chem* 268:3058-3066

- Chen Y-A, Cecchi L (1998) Gene transformation in *Oen. m. l.* Part I: (a) Transgenic plants: a production system for industrial and pharmaceutical proteins. *Wiley, Chichester* 17-24
- Cheng D-X, Roberts W, Aronson T, Jinn R, Baji G, Stanley CW, Landberg RA (1997) Expression of the human milk protein benactin in transgenic potato plants. *Transgenic res* 4:285-298
- Chughwale M, Faye L (1990) The production of recombinant therapeutic and industrial enzyme proteins in *Oen. m. l.* Part I (644) Transgenic plants: a production system for industrial and pharmaceutical proteins. *Wiley, Chichester* 19-24-114
- Quamer CL, Westermann DJ, Oishi NK, Chikara EA, Bennett S, Pappas E, Garbowitz GA, Ruten DN (1990) Bioengineering of human enzymes in transgenic tobacco. In: Collins GR, Shugart RJ (eds) *Engineering Plants for Commercial Products and Applications*. New York: Academic of Sciences, New York, pp 65-77
- Cramer CL, Westermann DJ, Chikara EA, Ruten DN (1993) High-level production of enzymatically active human lysozymal protein in transgenic plants. In: Oen MRL, Pan J (eds) *Transgenic plants: a production system for industrial and pharmaceutical proteins*. Wiley, Chichester, pp 299-310
- Quamer CL, Westermann DJ (1997) HMGCo pyruvate epimerase activity, glycolysis and post-harvest production of sugar products in plants and plant cell cultures. *UBP, Patent 3,670,349*
- Darvasi J, Lotan H, Rabinovich D (1986) Molecular cell biology. Scientific American, New York
- Delecluse J, Bontemps J, Delbarrat N (1999) Protein secretion in plant cells can occur via a default pathway. *Plant Cell* 251-29
- De Zeeuw GA, Peewick TR, Heideberger MA, Ali P, Schultze M, Rubin T (1999) The expression, localisation and effect of a human interferon  $\gamma$  in plants. *Virology* 122:213-221
- Dierckx W, Peigert A, Poyet C, Mariani MC, Gruber V, Boumard Z, Bandillon S, Mercet B (1997) Human lysozymal form transgenic tobacco. *Nature* 382:59-60
- DeGennaro MA, Nickbarg EL Jr (1974) Comments on the plasma treatment of the aneuploid procarotid-derives. *Birth Defects* 10:234-238
- Fang R-X, Nuly F, Sivaramakrishna S, Chua N-H (1989) Multiple deoxyribonucleic acid elements for optimal expression of the cauliflower mosaic virus 35S promoter in transgenic plants. *Plant Cell* 1:141-150
- Pavot T, Johnston JO, Strum A, Cutlipstick M (1996) 5'-terminal, nontranscribed, and function of an engineered protein on plant photoperiodic. *Plant Physiol* 152:99-116
- Frank S, Dargatzis I, Oen MRL, Guecheva A, Crookham P, Whitcomb GG (1993) Secretion of a functional single-chain Fv protein in transgenic tobacco plants and cell suspension cultures. *Plant Mol Biol* 25:61-69
- Quar PR, Arditi AG, Teichgraber ES, Strömberg R, Sautter G, Chang X, Alencar T (1998) Expression of human blood protein in transgenic plants: the cytochrome Cyt-CSP is a model protein. In: Oen MRL, Pan J (eds) *Transgenic plants: a production system for industrial and pharmaceutical proteins*. Wiley, Chichester, pp 281-297
- Grubishev GA, Burton VV, Putovos G, Dourbacheva IM, Banajiro TK, McKee MA, Parker C, Szallasi Z, Hill SC, Brady RO (1995) Expression therapy in type I Gaucher disease: comparative efficacy of human recombinant glucocerebrosidase from natural and recombinant sources. *Ann Intern Med* 123:313-39
- Grubishev GA (1999) Tobacco mosaic virus as a gene expression vector. *Agro-food-industry Biotech News* 10:299-309
- Grubishev GA (1997) Vent-ventured large scale production of drugs and pharmaceuticals in plants. Presentation at 13th and Annual International Symposium on Producing the Next Generation of Therapeutic Treatments: Transgenic Technologies, West Palm Beach, 5-4 Feb
- Grubishev GA, Wells JD, Gelboin B (1991) Cloning of human proinflammatory cytokines, interleukin-1, interleukin-2, interleukin-6, interleukin-8, interleukin-10, interleukin-12, interleukin-15, interleukin-18, interleukin-21, interleukin-22, interleukin-23, interleukin-24, interleukin-25, interleukin-26, interleukin-27, interleukin-28, interleukin-29, interleukin-30, interleukin-31, interleukin-32, interleukin-33, interleukin-34, interleukin-35, interleukin-36, interleukin-37, interleukin-38, interleukin-39, interleukin-40, interleukin-41, interleukin-42, interleukin-43, interleukin-44, interleukin-45, interleukin-46, interleukin-47, interleukin-48, interleukin-49, interleukin-50, interleukin-51, interleukin-52, interleukin-53, interleukin-54, interleukin-55, interleukin-56, interleukin-57, interleukin-58, interleukin-59, interleukin-60, interleukin-61, interleukin-62, interleukin-63, interleukin-64, interleukin-65, interleukin-66, interleukin-67, interleukin-68, interleukin-69, interleukin-70, interleukin-71, interleukin-72, interleukin-73, interleukin-74, interleukin-75, interleukin-76, interleukin-77, interleukin-78, interleukin-79, interleukin-80, interleukin-81, interleukin-82, interleukin-83, interleukin-84, interleukin-85, interleukin-86, interleukin-87, interleukin-88, interleukin-89, interleukin-90, interleukin-91, interleukin-92, interleukin-93, interleukin-94, interleukin-95, interleukin-96, interleukin-97, interleukin-98, interleukin-99, interleukin-100, interleukin-101, interleukin-102, interleukin-103, interleukin-104, interleukin-105, interleukin-106, interleukin-107, interleukin-108, interleukin-109, interleukin-110, interleukin-111, interleukin-112, interleukin-113, interleukin-114, interleukin-115, interleukin-116, interleukin-117, interleukin-118, interleukin-119, interleukin-120, interleukin-121, interleukin-122, interleukin-123, interleukin-124, interleukin-125, interleukin-126, interleukin-127, interleukin-128, interleukin-129, interleukin-130, interleukin-131, interleukin-132, interleukin-133, interleukin-134, interleukin-135, interleukin-136, interleukin-137, interleukin-138, interleukin-139, interleukin-140, interleukin-141, interleukin-142, interleukin-143, interleukin-144, interleukin-145, interleukin-146, interleukin-147, interleukin-148, interleukin-149, interleukin-150, interleukin-151, interleukin-152, interleukin-153, interleukin-154, interleukin-155, interleukin-156, interleukin-157, interleukin-158, interleukin-159, interleukin-160, interleukin-161, interleukin-162, interleukin-163, interleukin-164, interleukin-165, interleukin-166, interleukin-167, interleukin-168, interleukin-169, interleukin-170, interleukin-171, interleukin-172, interleukin-173, interleukin-174, interleukin-175, interleukin-176, interleukin-177, interleukin-178, interleukin-179, interleukin-180, interleukin-181, interleukin-182, interleukin-183, interleukin-184, interleukin-185, interleukin-186, interleukin-187, interleukin-188, interleukin-189, interleukin-190, interleukin-191, interleukin-192, interleukin-193, interleukin-194, interleukin-195, interleukin-196, interleukin-197, interleukin-198, interleukin-199, interleukin-200, interleukin-201, interleukin-202, interleukin-203, interleukin-204, interleukin-205, interleukin-206, interleukin-207, interleukin-208, interleukin-209, interleukin-210, interleukin-211, interleukin-212, interleukin-213, interleukin-214, interleukin-215, interleukin-216, interleukin-217, interleukin-218, interleukin-219, interleukin-220, interleukin-221, interleukin-222, interleukin-223, interleukin-224, interleukin-225, interleukin-226, interleukin-227, interleukin-228, interleukin-229, interleukin-230, interleukin-231, interleukin-232, interleukin-233, interleukin-234, interleukin-235, interleukin-236, interleukin-237, interleukin-238, interleukin-239, interleukin-240, interleukin-241, interleukin-242, interleukin-243, interleukin-244, interleukin-245, interleukin-246, interleukin-247, interleukin-248, interleukin-249, interleukin-250, interleukin-251, interleukin-252, interleukin-253, interleukin-254, interleukin-255, interleukin-256, interleukin-257, interleukin-258, interleukin-259, interleukin-260, interleukin-261, interleukin-262, interleukin-263, interleukin-264, interleukin-265, interleukin-266, interleukin-267, interleukin-268, interleukin-269, interleukin-270, interleukin-271, interleukin-272, interleukin-273, interleukin-274, interleukin-275, interleukin-276, interleukin-277, interleukin-278, interleukin-279, interleukin-280, interleukin-281, interleukin-282, interleukin-283, interleukin-284, interleukin-285, interleukin-286, interleukin-287, interleukin-288, interleukin-289, interleukin-290, interleukin-291, interleukin-292, interleukin-293, interleukin-294, interleukin-295, interleukin-296, interleukin-297, interleukin-298, interleukin-299, interleukin-300, interleukin-301, interleukin-302, interleukin-303, interleukin-304, interleukin-305, interleukin-306, interleukin-307, interleukin-308, interleukin-309, interleukin-310, interleukin-311, interleukin-312, interleukin-313, interleukin-314, interleukin-315, interleukin-316, interleukin-317, interleukin-318, interleukin-319, interleukin-320, interleukin-321, interleukin-322, interleukin-323, interleukin-324, interleukin-325, interleukin-326, interleukin-327, interleukin-328, interleukin-329, interleukin-330, interleukin-331, interleukin-332, interleukin-333, interleukin-334, interleukin-335, interleukin-336, interleukin-337, interleukin-338, interleukin-339, interleukin-340, interleukin-341, interleukin-342, interleukin-343, interleukin-344, interleukin-345, interleukin-346, interleukin-347, interleukin-348, interleukin-349, interleukin-350, interleukin-351, interleukin-352, interleukin-353, interleukin-354, interleukin-355, interleukin-356, interleukin-357, interleukin-358, interleukin-359, interleukin-360, interleukin-361, interleukin-362, interleukin-363, interleukin-364, interleukin-365, interle



- [illegible]

